Optimal control of uncertain stochastic systems with Markovian switching and its applications to portfolio decisions[1]

Weiyin Fei*

(School of Mathematics and Physics, Anhui Polytechnic University, Wuhu 241000, Anhui, P.R. China)

arXiv:1401.2531v1 [math.OC] 11 Jan 2014

Abstract: This paper first describes a class of uncertain stochastic control systems with Markovian switching, and derives an Itô-Liu formula for Markov-modulated processes. And we characterize an optimal control law, which satisfies the generalized Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation with Markovian switching. Then, by using the generalized HJB equation, we deduce the optimal consumption and portfolio policies under uncertain stochastic financial markets with Markovian switching. Finally, for constant relative risk-aversion (CRRA) felicity functions, we explicitly obtain the optimal consumption and portfolio policies. Moreover, we also make an economic analysis through numerical examples.

Keywords: Optimal control of uncertain stochastic systems; Markovian switching; generalized Itô-Liu formula; HJB equations; optimal consumption and portfolio; uncertain random variables.

I. INTRODUCTION

Uncertainty traditionally contains randomness, fuzziness and uncertainty resulting from their actions together. In many cases, fuzziness and randomness simultaneously appear in a system. To describe this phenomenon, the concept of fuzzy random variables was introduced by Kwakernaak [21] as a random variable taking fuzzy variable values. According to different requirements of measurability, different studies for fuzzy random variables were made by Puri and Ralescu [28], Liu and Liu [24]. The fuzzy random differential equations were studied by Fei [3], [4], and the references therein.

[1]Project supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (71171003) and Anhui Natural Science Foundation of Universities (KJ2012B019, KJ2013B023).

*Corresponding author: wyfei@dhu.edu.cn.

For stochastic dynamic systems, stochastic differential equations were studied by such researchers as Karatzas and Shreve [19]. When a fuzzy dynamic system is considered, fuzzy differential equations were investigated by Kaleva [18], Fei [7], [10], etc.

In a real world, some information and knowledge are usually represented by human linguistic expressions like “about 100km”, “approximately 80kg”, “warm”, “young”. Perhaps they are often considered to be subjective probability or fuzzy concepts. However, much research showed that those “unknown constants” and “unsharp concepts” behave neither like randomness nor like fuzziness. In order to distinguish this phenomenon from randomness and fuzziness, Liu [22] names it “uncertainty”. After further observations, we find that randomness and Liu’s uncertainty often appear simultaneously in a system. To describe this phenomenon, the concept of uncertain random variable was introduced by Liu [23] as a random variable taking “uncertain variable” values.

Under the stochastic context with Markovian switching, the control systems have been used to model many practical systems where they may experience abrupt changes in their structure and parameters caused by such phenomena as component failures or repairs, changing subsystem interconnections, and abrupt environmental disturbances in an economic system, etc. The control systems combine a part of the state that is driven by the canonical process and Brownian motion and another part of the state that takes discrete values. Mariton [25] explained that the hybrid systems had been emerging as a convenient mathematical framework for the formulation of various design problems in different fields like target tracking (evasive target tracking problem), fault tolerant control and manufacturing processes.

One of the important classes of the hybrid systems is the stochastic differential equations with Markovian switching. In operation, the system will switch from one mode to another in a random way, and the switching between the modes is governed by a Markovian chain. The optimal regulator, controllability, observability, stability and stabilization etc. need to be studied. For more information about the hybrid systems, the reader can refer to Feng et al. [12], Huang and Mao [16], and the references therein.

Hamilton [14] originally proposed the regime switching models of stock returns which proved to be a better representation of financial reality than the usual models with deterministic coefficients. Thereafter, regime switching models have been studied in different contexts. Option pricing in financial markets with regime switching has been studied, for instance, by Buffington

and Elliott [2], Guo and Zhang [13]. In financial markets with regime switching, the maximization of expected utility from consumption and/or terminal wealth has also been studied by Sotomayor and Cadenillas [30], and Zhang and Yin [32], etc. Under a mean-variance criterion, Zhou and Yin [34] propose a continuous-time Markowitz's mean-variance portfolio selection model with regime switching which obtains the efficient portfolio that minimizes the risk of terminal wealth given a fixed expected terminal wealth. In Fei [8], [9], the optimal control of Markovian switching systems with applications to optimal consumption and portfolio under inflation and Markovian switching is dicussed. The optimal portfolio selection with random fuzzy returns is explored in Huang [17].

Since randomness and Liu's uncertainty simultaneously appear in the financial market, we begin to consider the uncertain stochastic systems with Markovian switching. The uncertain stochastic system driven by the canonical process and Brownian motion will switch from one mode to another in a random way, and the switching between the modes is governed by a Markovian chain. After introducing the concept of uncertain random processes which is different from the one of You [31], we will generalize Itô-Liu formula, from which we deduce Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation or the optimality equation for the optimal control law. Next, by using the optimality equation for uncertain stochastic controls, we solve the optimal portfolio and consumption decision problem of an investor, which is its financial application. We obtain the explicit expression for the optimal consumption and portfolio. Finally, we make an economic analysis of the particular case of the constant relative risk-aversion (CRRA) utilities.

In fact, the initial contribution to consumption/investment problems in continuous-time was done by Merton [26], [27]. Other models of consumption-investment can be found in Fei [5], [6], Fei and Wu [11], Karatzas and Shreve [20], etc. The traditional financial modeling only deals with the continuously stochastic changing dynamics of a financial market. However, the market behavior is also affected by uncertain stochastic processes and a finite-state continuous-time Markovian chain that represents the uncertainty generated by the more steady market conditions. Based on the uncertain random calculus, the optimal consumption and portfolio strategies are obtained under the uncertain random context. Our model differs from the above papers and also answers a different economic question: What is the effect of both Markovian switching and uncertainty on the optimal consumption and portfolio?

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the general framework

of the uncertain stochastic optimal control problem with Markovian switching. Generalizing an Itô-Liu formula, we deduce an HJB equation for later research in the subsequent section. The policy of optimal consumption and portfolio under the uncertain random environment with Markovian switching is derived in Section 3. In Section 4, for the case of the CRRA utility, the optimal policies are explicitly given, and the numerical results of optimal policies together with an economic analysis of the investor's behavior are made. Finally, our concluding remarks are presented in Section 5.

II. Generalized Itô-Liu formula and equation of optimality

For convenience, we give some useful concepts at first. Let Γ be a nonempty set and $\mathcal{L}$ a σ-algebra over Γ. Each element $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ is called an event. A set function $\mathcal{M}$ defined on the σ-algebra over $\mathcal{L}$, which satisfies (i) Normality; (ii) Monotonicity; (iii) Self-Duality and (iv) Countable Subadditivity, is called an uncertain measure according to Liu [22]. Let a probability space be $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$.

Definition 2.1. (Liu [22]) Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an index set and let $(\Gamma, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$ be an uncertainty space. An uncertain process $X(t, \gamma)$ is a measurable function from $\mathcal{T} \times (\Gamma, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$ to the set of real numbers, i.e., for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and any Borel set B of real numbers, the set $\{X(t) \in B\} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma | X(t, \gamma) \in B\}$ is an event.

The concepts and properties of the canonical process and other uncertain processes refer to Chapter 9 Liu [22]. In what follows, we give the notation of uncertain random variables.

Definition 2.2. (Liu and Li [24]) An uncertain random variable is a function ξ from a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ to the set of uncertain variables such that $\mathcal{M}\{\xi(\omega) \in B\}$ is a measurable function of ω for any Borel set B of $\mathbb{R}$.

We now give the concept of expected value of an uncertain random variable.

Definition 2.3. Let ξ be an uncertain random variable. Then its expected value is defined by

$$E[\xi] = E_P[E_U[\xi]]$$

provided that the right hand operations are well defined. Here, the operators E_P and E_U stand for probability expectation and uncertain expectation, respectively.

Obviously, if both a and b are constant, then $E[aC_t + bB_t] = 0$, where C_t and B_t are a scalar canonical process and a Wiener process (Brownian motion), respectively.

Definition 2.4. A hybrid process $X(t, \gamma, \omega)$ is called an uncertain stochastic process if for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $X(t)$ is an uncertain random variable. An uncertain stochastic process $X(t)$ is called continuous if the sample paths of $X(t)$ are all continuous functions of t for almost all $(\gamma, \omega) \in (\Gamma, \Omega)$.

Definition 2.5. (Itô-Liu integral) Let $X(t) = (Y(t), Z(t))$ be an uncertain stochastic process. For any partition of closed interval $[a, b]$ with $a = t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_{N+1} = b$, the mesh is written as $\Delta = \max_{1<i<N} |t_{i+1} - t_i|$. Then the Itô-Liu integral of $X(t)$ with respect to (B_t, C_t) is defined as follows,

$$\int_a^b X(s)d(B_s, C_s) = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Y(t_i)(B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}) + Z(t_i)(C_{t_{i+1}} - C_{t_i}))$$

provided that it exists in mean square and is an uncertain random variable, where C_t and B_t are one-dimensional canonical process and one-dimensional Wiener process, respectively. In this case, $X(t)$ is called Itô-Liu integrable. Specially, when $Y(t) \equiv 0$, $X(t)$ is called Liu integrable.

Next, we deduce Itô-Liu formula for the case of mult-dimensional uncertain stochastic processes.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $B = (B_t)_{0 \le t \le T} = (B_t^1, \cdots, B_t^m)^\top_{0 \le t \le T}$ and $C = (C_t)_{0 \le t \le T} = (C_t^1, \cdots, C_t^n)^\top_{0 \le t \le T}$ be an m-dimensional standard Wiener process and an n-dimensional canonical process, respectively. Assume that uncertain stochastic processes $X_1(t), X_2(t), \cdots, X_p(t)$ are given by*

$$dX_k(t) = u_k(t)dt + \sum_{l=1}^{m} v_{kl}(t)dB_t^l + \sum_{l=1}^{n} w_{kl}(t)dC_t^l, \quad k = 1, \cdots, p,$$

where $u_k(t)$ are all absolute integrable uncertain stochastic processes, $v_{kl}(t)$ are all square integrable uncertain stochastic processes and $w_{kl}(t)$ are all Liu integrable uncertain stochastic processes. For $k, l = 1, \cdots, p$, let $\frac{\partial G}{\partial t}(t, x_1, \cdots, x_p)$, $\frac{\partial G}{\partial x_k}(t, x_1, \cdots, x_p)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial x_k x_l}(t, x_1, \cdots, x_p)$ be

continuously functions. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&dG(t, X_1(t), \cdots, X_p(t)) \\
&= \tfrac{\partial G}{\partial t}(t, X_1(t), \cdots, X_p(t))dt + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \tfrac{\partial G}{\partial x_k}(t, X_1(t), \cdots, X_p(t))dX_k(t) \\
&\quad + \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \tfrac{\partial^2 G}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(t, X_1(t), \cdots, X_p(t))dX_k(t)dX_l(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $dB_t^k dB_t^l = \delta_{kl}dt, dB_t^k dt = dC_t^\imath dC_t^\jmath = dC_t^\imath dt = dB_t^k dC_t^\imath = 0$, *for* $k, l = 1, \cdots, m, \imath, \jmath = 1, \cdots, n$. *Here*

$$\delta_{kl} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if} \quad k \neq l \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Similar to the discussion in You [31], we easily derive our Theorem 2.6 for uncertain stochastic processes. Thus, the proof is complete. □

Remark 2.7. Similar to the discussions in You [31], we can obtain the counterparts of Itô-Liu formulas for multi-dimensional uncertain stochastic processes. Here, the further discussions is omitted.

In reality, the uncertain stochastic systems may experience abrupt changes in their structure and parameters, so we characterize this phenomenon by an uncertain stochastic context with Markovian switching. To this end, we make some preliminaries.

Now we consider m-dimensional standard Brownian motion $(B_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ and n-dimensional canonical process $(C_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$. We observe a continuous-time, stationary, finite-state Markov chain $\zeta = (\zeta(t))_{0\leq t\leq T}$, and denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the state-space of this Markov chain: that is, for every $t \in [0, T], \zeta(t) \in \mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \cdots, S\}$, where $S \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$. Here, the stochastic process $\zeta(t, \omega)$ represents the regime (mode) of the random environment at time t and depends only on $\omega \in \Omega$. S is the number of regimes. Assume that the Markov chain has a strongly irreducible generator $Q = (q_{ij})_{S\times S}$, where $q_{ii} \triangleq -\lambda_i < 0$ and $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} q_{ij} = 0$ for every regime $i \in \mathcal{S}$. Denote by $\mathbb{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_t, t \in [0, T]\}$ the $\mathbb{P}$-augmentation of filtration $\{\mathcal{A}_t^{B,\zeta}\}$ generated by the stochastic processes B, ζ, where $\mathcal{A}_t^{B,\zeta} \triangleq \sigma\{B_s, \zeta(s), 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. We assume that the Markov chain $\zeta(\cdot)$ is independent of the Brownian motion B.

Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a separable metric space, for a control variable D, we consider the following uncertain stochastic controlled system with Markovian switching, for $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = & f(t,X(t),D(t),\zeta(t))dt + g(t,X(t),D(t),\zeta(t))dB_t \\ & +h(t,X(t),D(t),\zeta(t))dC_t, \quad X(0)=x, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f &= (f_1,\cdots,f_p)^\top : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^p\times\mathbb{U}\times\mathcal{S}\to\mathbb{R}^p, \\ g &= (g_{kl})_{p\times m} : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^p\times\mathbb{U}\times\mathcal{S}\to\mathbb{R}^{p\times m}, \\ h &= (h_{kl})_{p\times n} : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^p\times\mathbb{U}\times\mathcal{S}\to\mathbb{R}^{p\times n}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the cost functional of our control problem is as follows

$$J(x,i;D) = E\left\{\int_0^T \Phi_1(t,X(t),D(t),\zeta(t))dt + \Phi_2(T,X(t),\zeta(T))\right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} \triangleq \ & \{D:[0,T]\times\Gamma\times\Omega\to\mathbb{U} \mid D \text{ is measurable and for each} \\ & \gamma\in\Gamma, D(\gamma) \text{ is } \mathbb{A}\text{-adapted, and satisfies} \\ & E\left[\int_0^T \Phi_1^+(t,X(t),D(t),\zeta(t))dt\right] < +\infty, \\ & E\left[\int_0^T \Phi_2^+(T,X(t),\zeta(t))dt\right] < +\infty, \\ & E\left[\int_0^T |D(t)|^2 dt\right] < +\infty\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $a^+ \triangleq \max(a,0), a^- \triangleq \max(-a,0)$ for every $a\in[-\infty,\infty]$, and $|\cdot|$ denotes the norm of a vector or matrix.

Under certain assumptions (which will be specified below), for any $D(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, Eq. (2.1) admits a unique solution, and the cost (2.2) is well-defined. The optimal control problem can be stated as follows.

Problem 2.8. Select an admissible control $\hat{D}\in\mathcal{U}$ that minimizes $J(x,y,i;D))$ and find a value function V defined by $V(x,i)\triangleq\inf_{D\in\mathcal{U}} J(x,i;D)$. The control $\hat{D}$ is called an optimal control.

Next, we need to consider a family of optimal control problems with different initial times and states along a given state trajectory in order to apply the optimal principle for uncertain stochastic optimal control. For this, we set up the following framework. For any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^m$, consider the state equation, $s\in[t,T]$,

$$\begin{cases} dX(s) = & f(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))ds + g(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))dB_s \\ & +h(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))dC_s, \quad X(t)=x. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

The corresponding cost functional is

$$J(t,x,i;D)=E\left[\int_t^T \Phi_1(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))ds+\Phi_2(T,X(T),\zeta(T))\right]. \tag{2.4}$$

Define the value function $V(t,x,i)$ by $V(t,x,i)\overset{\triangle}{=}\inf_{D\in\mathcal{U}} J(t,x,i;D)$.

For our aim, we make the following hypothesis.

Assumption 2.9. (1) Assume that coefficients f,g and h are locally Lipschitzian continuous, that is, there exists one nonnegative function $H_N(D)$, where $H_N(D)$ is possibly dependent of the control variable D, such that the following inequality holds for $\hbar=f,g,h$,

$$|\hbar(t,x,D,i)-\hbar(t,y,D,i)|<H_N(D)|x-y|,$$

for all $(t,D,i)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{S}$ and those $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^p$ with $|x|\vee|y|\leq N$. Moreover, for g,h, the special growth conditions hold, that is, there is a constant L_N such that

$$|g(t,x,D,i)|\vee|h(t,x,D,i)|<L_N(1+|x|+\tilde{H}(x)|D|),$$

for all $(t,D,i)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{S}$ and $|x|\leq N$, where the nonnegative function $\tilde{H}$ is locally bounded.

(2) For the cost functions of the control problem $\Phi_l, l=1,2$, there exists a constant $K>0$, for all $i\in\mathcal{S}$,

$$\Phi_1(t,x,D,i)\geq -K(1+\phi_1(x)|D|^2),\quad \Phi_2(t,x,i)\geq -K(1+\phi_2(x)),$$

where the nonnegative functions $\phi_l, l=1,2$, are continuous in x.

Similar to the discussion for fuzzy differential equations in Fei [7], it is known that under Assumption 2.9 (1), Eq. (2.1) has a unique continuous solution $X(t)=X(t,D(t),\zeta(t))$ on $t\in[0,T]$ for each $D\in\mathcal{U}$.

Remark 2.10. We will see that Assumption 2.9 holds for the linear system and special cost functions Φ_1 and Φ_2 in the next section. For more general systems, we will study the existence and uniqueness of solutions to uncertain stochastic controlled systems, and the properties of value functions of our control problems in future.

In order to solve our problem, now we generalize Itô-Liu lemma for an uncertain stochastic process with Markovian swithcing as follows. For sake of simplicity, we drop the arguments whenever convenient, and denote

$$f(t) = f(t, X(t), D(t), \zeta(t)), g(t) = g(t, X(t), D(t), \zeta(t)), h(t) = h(t, X(t), D(t), \zeta(t)).$$

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose that the state $X(t) = (X_1(t), \cdots, X_p(t))^\top$ of an uncertain stochastic system satisfies Eq. (2.1). For $\forall\, i \in \mathcal{S}, k, l = 1, \cdots, p$, let $\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(t, x, i)$, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(t, x, i)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k x_l}(t, x, i)$ be continuously functions, where $x = (x_1, \cdots, x_p)^\top$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & dF(t, X(t), \zeta(t)) \\ &= \tfrac{\partial F}{\partial t}(t, X(t), \zeta(t))dt + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \tfrac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(t, X(t), \zeta(t))dX_k(t) \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \tfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(t, X(t), \zeta(t))dX_k(t)dX_l(t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{S} q_{\zeta(t)j} F(t, X(t), j)dt + dM_t^F, \end{aligned}$$

where the uncertain stochastic process $(M_t^F)_{0 \le t \le T}$ is a real-valued martingale relative to the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{P})$, $dB_t^k dB_t^l = \delta_{kl} dt, dB_t^k dt = dC_t^\imath dC_t^\jmath = dC_t^\imath dt = dB_t^k dC_t^\imath = 0$, for $k, l = 1, \cdots, m, \imath, \jmath = 1, \cdots, n$. Here, δ_{kl} is defined in Theorem 2.6.

Proof. It is well known that almost every sample path of $\zeta(t)$ is a right-continuous step function. It is useful to recall that a continuous-time Markov chain $\zeta(t)$ can be represented as a stochastic integral with respect to a Poisson random measure (cf. Lemma 3 in Skorohod [29]):

$$d\zeta(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hbar(X(t), \zeta(t), z)\nu(dz \times dt),$$

where $\nu(dz \times dt)$ is a Poisson random measure with intensity $m(dz) \times dt$ in which m is a Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

Let $0 < \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_n < t$ be all the times when $\zeta(t)$ has a jump. From Theorem 2.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \ell) - F(0, X(0), \ell) \\ &= \textstyle\int_0^{\tau_1} \tfrac{\partial F}{\partial t}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))ds + \int_0^{\tau_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \tfrac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s) \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2} \textstyle\int_0^{\tau_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \tfrac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s)dX_l(s), \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&F(\tau_{k+1}, X(\tau_{k+1}), \ell) - F(\tau_k, X(\tau_k), \ell) \\
&= \int_{\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))ds + \int_{\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s)dX_l(s),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&F(t, X(t), \ell) - F(\tau_n, X(\tau_n), \ell) \\
&= \int_{\tau_n}^{t} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))ds + \int_{\tau_n}^{t} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau_n}^{t} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s)dX_l(s).
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting $\ell = i$ in the first equation, $\ell = \zeta_{\tau_k}$ in the second, and $\ell = \zeta_{\tau_n}$ in the third and adding them over k from 1 to $n+1$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&F(t, X(t), \zeta(t)) - F(0, X(0), i) \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))ds + \int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s)dX_l(s) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n} [F(\tau_k, X(\tau_k), \zeta(\tau_k)) - F(\tau_k, X(\tau_k), \zeta(\tau_k -))] \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))ds + \int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{l=1}^{p} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dX_k(s)dX_l(s) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [F(s, X(s), \zeta(s) + \hbar(X(s), \zeta(s), z)) - F(s, X(s), \zeta(s))]m(dz)ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [F(s, X(s), \zeta(s) + \hbar(X(s), \zeta(s), z)) - F(s, X(s), \zeta(s))]\mu(dz \times ds),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mu(dz \times dt) = \nu(dz \times dt) - m(dz) \times dt$ is a martingale measure relative to the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{P})$. Similar to the discussion of Lemma 3 (p. 104) in Skorohod [29], noting that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [F(s, X(s), \zeta(s) + \hbar(X(s), \zeta(s), z)) - F(s, X(s), \zeta(s))]m(dz)ds \\
&\quad = \sum_{j=1}^{S} q_{\zeta(s)j} F(s, X(s), j),
\end{aligned}
$$

we get the claim by differentiating the above equation. Thus, the proof is complete. □

In Yong and Zhou [33], they discussed the principle of optimality and the HJB equation for stochastic optimal control. Next, we similarly explore those for uncertain stochastic optimal control. First, we derive the principle of optimality for uncertain stochastic optimal control (2.4) with the constraint (2.3).

Theorem 2.12. (Principle of optimality) *Let assumption 2.9 hold. For any* $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^p$*, we have*

$$V(t,x,i) = \inf_{D \in \mathcal{U}} E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds + V(\hat{t}, X(\hat{t}), \zeta(\hat{t}))\right],\ 0 \le t \le \hat{t} \le T. \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. From Assumption 2.9 (2), for $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $0 \le t \le \hat{t} \le T$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\ge -E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1^-(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds\right] \\ &\ge -E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} (1 + \phi_1(X(s))|D(s)|^2)ds\right] > -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$0 \le E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1^+(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds\right] < +\infty,$$

which shows

$$\left|E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds\right]\right| < +\infty.$$

Likewise, we can obtain

$$|E[\Phi_2(T, X(t), \zeta(T))]| < +\infty.$$

Thus, we show the right hand of the identity (2.5) is well defined.

Next, we denote the right side of (2.5) by $\widetilde{V}(t,x,i)$. It follows from the definition of $V(t,x,i)$ that, for any $D \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\begin{aligned} V(t,x,i) \le \quad & E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{\hat{t}}^T \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds + \Phi_2(T, X(T), \zeta(T))\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since the uncertain processes $dC_s(s \in [t, \hat{t}))$ and $dC_s(s \in [\hat{t}, T])$ are independent, we know that

$$\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds \text{ and } \int_{\hat{t}}^T \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds$$

are independent relative to the uncertain space $(\Gamma, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$. Thus, by Theorem 1 in Zhu [35], we get

$$\begin{aligned} V(t,x,i) \le \quad & E\left\{\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds \right. \\ & \left. + E\left[\int_{\hat{t}}^T \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds + \Phi_2(T, X(T), \zeta(T))\right]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum for above inequality with respect to $D \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $V(t,x,i) \leq \widetilde{V}(t,x,i)$. On the other hand, for $\forall D \in \mathcal{U}$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[\int_t^T \Phi_1(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))ds + \Phi_2(T,X(T),\zeta(T))\right] \\
&= E\left\{\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))ds \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E\left[\int_{\hat{t}}^T \Phi_1(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))ds + \Phi_2(T,X(T),\zeta(T))\right]\right\} \\
&\geq E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))ds + V(\hat{t},X(\hat{t}),\zeta(\hat{t}))\right] \geq \widetilde{V}(t,x,i)
\end{aligned}$$

which shows $V(t,x,i) \geq \widetilde{V}(t,x,i)$. Consequently, $V(t,x,i) = \widetilde{V}(t,x,i)$. Thus, the proof of the theorem is complete. □

Let $C^{1,2}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^p;\mathbb{R})$ denote all functions $V(t,x,i)$ on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^p$ which are continuously differentiable in t, continuously twice differentiable in x for each $i \in \mathcal{S}$. If $V(\cdot,i) \in C^{1,2}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^p;\mathbb{R})$, define operators $L_i(D)V$, for each $i \in \mathcal{S}$, by

$$\begin{aligned}
&L_i(D)V(t,x,i) \\
&\triangleq \tfrac{\partial V}{\partial t}(t,x,i) + \sum_{k=1}^p \tfrac{\partial V}{\partial x_k}(t,x,i) f_k(t,x,D,i) \\
&\quad + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^p\sum_{l=1}^p \tfrac{\partial^2 V}{x_k x_l}(t,x,i)\sum_{\imath=1}^m g_{k\imath}(t,x,D,i)g_{l\imath}(t,x,D,i).
\end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we give the optimal equation of the optimal control problem.

Theorem 2.13. *Let Assumption 2.9 hold. Then V is a solution of the following terminal problem of a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation*

$$\inf_{D\in\mathcal{U}}\{L_i(D)V(t,x,i) + \Phi_1(t,x,D,i)\} = \lambda_i V(t,x,i) - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}\setminus\{i\}} q_{ij}V(t,x,j) \tag{2.6}$$

with the terminal condition $V(T,x,i) = \Phi_2(T,x,i)$.

Proof. Let a and b satisfy $0 < a < |X(t)| < b < +\infty$. We define the first hitting times $\tau_a \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X(t)| = a\}, \tau_b \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X(t)| = b\}$, and $\tau \triangleq \tau_a \wedge \tau_b$.

For $\forall t, \hat{t} \in [0,T]$, from Lemma 2.11 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&V(\hat{t}\wedge\tau, X(\hat{t}\wedge\tau), \zeta(\hat{t}\wedge\tau)) - V(t,x,i) \\
&= \int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau}[L_{\zeta(s)}V(s,X(s),\zeta(s)) + \sum_{j=1}^S q_{\zeta(s)j}V(s,X(s),j)]ds \\
&\quad + \int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau}\sum_{k=1}^p\sum_{l=1}^m g_{kl}(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))\tfrac{\partial V}{\partial x_k}(s,X(s),\zeta(s))dB_s^l \\
&\quad + \int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau}\sum_{k=1}^p\sum_{l=1}^n h_{kl}(s,X(s),D(s),\zeta(s))\tfrac{\partial V}{\partial x_k}(s,X(s),\zeta(s))dC_s^l + (M^V_{\hat{t}\vee\tau} - M^V_t).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Since the uncertain stochastic process $(M_t^V)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is a real-valued martingale relative to the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{P})$, we easily know $E[M_{\hat{t}\vee\tau}^V] = E[M_t^V]$. Note that for all $i \in \mathcal{S}$, the functions $V_x(t, x, i)$ be bounded when $|x|$ is bounded. Therefore, by Assumption 2.9 (1) and $E[\int_0^T |D(t)|^2 dt] < +\infty$, we easily deduce

$$E\left|\int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau} \sum_{k=1}^{p}\sum_{l=1}^{m} g_{kl}(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dB_s^l\right|^2 < +\infty.$$

Hence, we get

$$E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau} \sum_{k=1}^{p}\sum_{l=1}^{m} g_{kl}(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dB_s^l\right] = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

On the other hand, similar to the discussion of Theorem 12.17 in Liu [22], it is easy to check that

$$E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau} \sum_{k=1}^{p}\sum_{l=1}^{n} h_{kl}(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_k}(s, X(s), \zeta(s))dC_s^l\right] = o(\hat{t} - t). \tag{2.9}$$

Taking the expectation with respect to (2.7), together with (2.8) and (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[V(\hat{t}, X(\hat{t}), \zeta(\hat{t}))] &= V(t, x, i) \\ &+E\left[\int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau}(L_{\zeta(s)}V(s, X(s), \zeta(s)) + \sum_{j=1}^{S} q_{\zeta(s)j}V(s, X(s), j))ds\right] + o(\hat{t} - t). \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

By using the principle of optimality (Theorem 2.12) and (2.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \inf_{D\in\mathcal{U}} E\Big[&\int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds \\ &+ \int_t^{\hat{t}\wedge\tau}(L_{\zeta(s)}V(s, X(s), \zeta(s)) + \sum_{j=1}^{S} q_{\zeta(s)j}V(s, X(s), j))ds + o(\hat{t} - t)\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Now letting $a \downarrow 0$ and $b \uparrow \infty$, we obtain $\tau \to T$. Therefore, applying the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \inf_{D\in\mathcal{U}} E\Big[&\int_t^{\hat{t}} \Phi_1(s, X(s), D(s), \zeta(s))ds \\ &+ \int_t^{\hat{t}}(L_{\zeta(s)}V(s, X(s), \zeta(s)) + \sum_{j=1}^{S} q_{\zeta(s)j}V(s, X(s), j))ds + o(\hat{t} - t)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Dividing Eq. (2.11) by $\hat{t} - t$, and letting $\hat{t} \to t$, we get Eq. (2.6). The terminal condition of Eq. (2.6) holds obviously. Thus, we complete the proof. □

III. UNCERTAIN RANDOM FINANCIAL MARKET SET-UP

Applying the above results, we introduce a financial market with regime switching in this section. Let a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{P})$ hosting m-dimensional Wiener process $(B_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ and an uncertain space $(\Gamma, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$ hosting n-demensional canonical process $(C_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$, respectively. The Wiener process $(B_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ and the canonical process $(C_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ model risky uncertainties and behavior uncertainties in financial assets, respectively. The regime switching is a Markov chain which has a strongly irreducible generator Q as in Section 2.

Assume that uncertain stochastic processes $P_0(t)$ and $P_k(t), k = 1, \ldots, m$, on $[0, T]$ represent the prices of the riskless asset and the m risky assets, respectively. They satisfy the Markovian switching uncertain stochastic differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} dP_0(t) = &\ r_{\zeta(t)}(t)P_0(t)dt, \\ dP_k(t) = &\ \alpha^k_{\zeta(t)}(t)P_k(t)dt + \sigma^k_{\zeta(t)}(t)P_k(t)dB_t + \eta^k_{\zeta(t)}(t)P_k(t)dC_t, \end{aligned}$$

with initial prices $P_0(0) = 1$ and $P^k(0) = p_k > 0$, and initial state $\zeta(0) = \zeta_0$. Here, $r_{\zeta(t)}(t)$, $\alpha_{\zeta(t)}(t) = (\alpha^1_{\zeta(t)}(t), , \cdots, \alpha^m_{\zeta(t)}(t))^\top$, $\sigma^k_{\zeta(t)}(t) = (\sigma^{k1}_{\zeta(t)}(t), \cdots, \sigma^{km}_{\zeta(t)}(t))$, and $\eta^k_{\zeta(t)}(t) = (\eta^{k1}_{\zeta(t)}(t),$ $\cdots, \eta^{kn}_{\zeta(t)}(t))$ $(k = 1, \cdots, m)$ are deterministic and bounded interest rate, expected returns, random volatility functions and uncertain volatility functions, respectively. Denote

$$\sigma_{\zeta(t)}(t) = (\sigma^1_{\zeta(t)}(t), , \cdots, \sigma^m_{\zeta(t)}(t))^\top, \eta_{\zeta(t)}(t) = (\eta^1_{\zeta(t)}(t), , \cdots, \eta^m_{\zeta(t)}(t))^\top.$$

We suppose that $\Lambda_i(t) \triangleq \sigma_i(t)\sigma_i(t)^\top, i \in \mathcal{S}$, are positive definite, and the coefficients of the market (i.e., r, α, σ, η) depend on the regime of an economy. We easily know $\Lambda_i(t)$ is deterministic and bounded. The agent chooses a portfolio $\pi = \{\pi(t) = (\pi^1(t), \cdots, \pi^m(t))^\top, t \in [0, T]\}$, representing the fraction of wealth invested in each risky asset. We need a technical condition to be satisfied. A portfolio vector process is an uncertain stochastic vector process π such that $E\left[\int_0^t \pi^\top(s)\Lambda_{\zeta(t)}\pi(s)ds\right] < +\infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. The fraction of wealth invested in the riskless asset at time $t \in [0, T]$ is then $1 - \sum_{k=1}^m \pi^k(t)$. The investor also chooses a consumption rate process $c = \{c(t), t \in [0, T]\}$: a nonnegative uncertain stochastic process such that $E\left[\int_0^t c^2(s)ds\right] < \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Let the market price of risk of the market be $\theta_{\zeta(t)}(t) \triangleq \sigma^{-1}_{\zeta(t)}(t)(\alpha_{\zeta(t)}(t) - r_\zeta(t)\mathbf{1})$, where

$\mathbf{1} = (1, \cdots, 1)^\top$. Now the evolution of the nominal wealth $W(t)$ at time t can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} dW(t) = \ & r_{\zeta(t)}(t)W(t)dt + W(t)\pi^\top(t)\sigma_{\zeta(t)}(t)d[B_t + \theta_{\zeta(t)}(t)] \\ & + W(t)\pi^\top(t)\eta_{\zeta(t)}(t)dC_t - c(t)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

We introduce the utility functions $U_1(\cdot)$ and $U_2(\cdot)$ of consumption and wealth, respectively, which are assumed to be twice differentiable, strictly increasing, and concave. Moreover, $U_l'(0) = \infty,\ U_l'(\infty) = 0, l = 1, 2$. It is easily to see that there exists a constant K such that $U_l(y) \leq K(1 + y^2), l = 1, 2$.

Given $t \in [0, T]$, we now define the objective function which depends on the the market regimes as follows

$$\mathbb{J}(t, x, i; \pi, c) = E\left[\int_t^T e^{-\beta(s-t)} U_1\left(c(s)\right) ds + e^{-\beta(T-t)} U_2\left(W(T)\right)\right],$$

where for $s \in [t, T]$, the wealth $W(s)$ with $W(t) = x$ follows (3.1), β is the utility discount rate, which may be different from the risk-free rate. The control process $D \stackrel{\triangle}{=} (\pi, c)$, that satisfies

$$E\left[\int_0^T e^{-\beta t} U_1^-\left(c(t)\right) dt + e^{-\beta T} U_2^-\left(W(T)\right)\right] < +\infty,$$

will be called an admissible control process. The set of all admissible controls will be denoted by Ξ. We define the value function by

$$\mathbb{V}(t, x, i) = \sup_{(\pi, c) \in \Xi} \mathbb{J}(t, x, i; \pi, c), \tag{3.2}$$

which shows that the agent selects consumption and investment processes in order to maximize the sum of his expected discounted utilities from consumption and terminal wealth.

In what follows, we deduce the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation satisfied by optimal consumption and portfolio policies. For this, denote operators $\mathbb{L}_i(D)\mathbb{V}$, for each $i \in \mathcal{S}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{L}_i(D)\mathbb{V}(t, x, i) = \mathbb{L}(\pi, c)\mathbb{V}(t, x, i) \\ & \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \tfrac{1}{2} x^2 \pi^\top \Lambda_i(t) \pi \mathbb{V}_{xx} + x\pi^\top \sigma_i(t)\theta_i(t)\mathbb{V}_x(t, x, i) \\ & \quad + r_i(t) x \mathbb{V}_x - c\mathbb{V}_x - \beta\mathbb{V} + \mathbb{V}_t(t, x, i). \end{aligned}$$

We now give the equation of optimality for the optimal policy as the main theorem in this section.

Theorem 3.1. (Equation of optimality) *For each $i \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathbb{V}(\cdot, i)$ is a solution of the following terminal problem of the HJB equation*

$$\sup_{(\pi, c) \in \Xi} [\mathbb{L}_i(\pi, c)\mathbb{V}(t, x, i) + U_1(c)] = \lambda_i \mathbb{V}(t, x, i) - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{S} \setminus \{i\}} q_{ij}(t, x, j)\mathbb{V}(t, x, i) \tag{3.3}$$

with the terminal condition $\mathbb{V}(T,x,i)=U_2(x)$.

Proof. In terms of the state equation (3.1), we assume, in Theorem 2.13,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi_1(t,x,\pi,c,i)=-e^{-\beta t}U_1(c),\\
&\Phi_2(T,x,i)=-e^{-\beta T}U_2(x),\\
&f(t,x,\pi,c,i)=r_i(t)x+x\pi^\top\sigma_i(t)\theta_i(t)-c,\\
&g(t,x,\pi,c,i)=x\pi^\top\sigma_i(t),\\
&h(t,x,\pi,c,i)=x\pi^\top\eta_i(t),
\end{aligned}$$

which show that the value function $\mathbb{V}(t,x,i)$ in (3.2) equals to $-e^{\beta t}V(t,x,i)$, where V solves the equation (2.6). By the definitions of utility functions $U_1(\cdot)$ and $U_2(\cdot)$, we can take $\phi_1(x)=1$ and $\phi_2(x)=x$ in Assumption 2.2 (2). Hence, the conditions of Theorem 2.13 are fulfilled, moreover from the HJB equation (2.6), we derive that $\mathbb{V}(t,x,i)$ satisfies the Eq. (3.3). Thus, the proof is complete. □

Corollary 3.2. *The optimal consumption and portfolio problem (3.2) has the optimal policy as follows*

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}(t,x,\zeta(t))=&\quad \Psi_1(\mathbb{V}_x(t,x,\zeta(t))),\\
\hat{\pi}(t,x,\zeta(t))=&\quad -\tfrac{\mathbb{V}_x(t,x,\zeta(t))}{x\mathbb{V}_{xx}(t,x,\zeta(t))}\left(\sigma^\top_{\zeta(t)}(t)\right)^{-1}\theta_{\zeta(t)}(t)
\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

where $\Psi_1(\cdot)$ *is the unique inverse function of* $U_1'(\cdot)$.

Proof. Since the consumption policy can be solved by the concave maximization in (3.3), we get the optimal feedback consumption policy. In order to get the portfolio policy, we make a quadratic maximization problem in (3.3). □

IV. Optimal strategies for CRRA utility

In this section, we discuss a special case of an investor with CRRA utility. Let the utility functions of an investor be $U_l(z)=\frac{z^{1-\kappa}}{1-\kappa},\ \kappa>0,\ \kappa\neq 1,\ l=1,2$. Thus, we obtain $\Psi_l(y)=y^{-1/\kappa}$, where $\Psi_l(\cdot)$ are the inverse functions of $U_l'(\cdot), l=1,2$. From (3.3) of Theorem 3.1 and optimal policy (π,c) of (3.4), we easily deduce that the value function $\mathbb{V}$ satisfies the HJB equation as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{V}_t(t,x,i)-\beta\mathbb{V}(t,x,i)+r_i(t)x\mathbb{V}_x(t,x,i)+\tfrac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}\mathbb{V}_x(t,x,i)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}}\\
&-\tfrac{|\theta_i(t)\mathbb{V}_x(t,x,i)|^2}{2\mathbb{V}_{xx}(t,x,i)}=\lambda_i\mathbb{V}(t,x,i)-\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}\setminus\{i\}}q_{ij}\mathbb{V}(t,x,j)
\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

with the terminal condition $\mathbb{V}(T,x,i)=U_2(x)=\frac{1}{1-\kappa}x^{1-\kappa}$.

We guess the form of solution to the equation (4.1) as follows

$$\mathbb{V}(t,x,i)=\frac{1}{1-\kappa}A_i^{\kappa}(t)x^{1-\kappa},$$

which shows , for $i=1,\cdots,S$,

$$\kappa A_i^{\kappa-1}(t)A_i'(t)-\rho_i(t)A_i^{\kappa}(t)+\kappa A_i^{\kappa-1}(t)+\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}\setminus\{i\}}q_{ij}A_j^{\kappa}(t)=0,\ A_i(T)=1, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\rho_i(t)\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\beta+\lambda_i-(1-\kappa)r_i(t)-\tfrac{1-\kappa}{2\kappa}|\theta_i(t)|^2.$$

By the existence and uniqueness theorem (cf., Hirsch et al. [15], p. 144), the system of equations (4.2) has the unique solution $\{A_i(t),i=1,\cdots,S\}$. From (3.4), we get

$$\begin{array}{ll}\hat{c}(t,x,i)= & \frac{x}{A_i(t)},\\ \hat{\pi}(t,x,i)= & \frac{1}{\kappa}\left(\sigma_i^{\top}(t)\right)^{-1}\theta_i(t).\end{array} \tag{4.3}$$

The formula (4.3) shows that an investor's consumption rate is higher as he is wealthier. Also, the investor invests more in the risky assets, the higher the market price of risk and the lower the risks of the risky assets.

From now on, for sake of convenience, we only discuss the following first-order nonlinear differential dynamic system (i.e., $S=2$)

$$\begin{array}{l}\kappa A_1^{\kappa-1}A_1'-\rho_1A_1^{\kappa}+\kappa A_1^{\kappa-1}+\lambda_1A_2^{\kappa}=0,\ A_1(T)=1,\\ \kappa A_2^{\kappa-1}A_2'-\rho_2A_2^{\kappa}+\kappa A_2^{\kappa-1}+\lambda_2A_1^{\kappa}=0,\ A_2(T)=1.\end{array} \tag{4.4}$$

By the numerical solution to the equations (4.4), we give the economic analysis of the related results.

Now let us consider the following numerical example. There are two financial assets: a risk-free asset and a risky asset. The market coefficients follow: $\alpha_1=0.15,\alpha_2=0.25$, $\sigma_1=0.25,\sigma_2=0.6$, $r_1=0.05$, $r_2=0.01$, $\lambda_1=1.2,\lambda_2=2.5,T=1$.

First, we consider a high risk-aversion investor with $\kappa=10$ and $\beta=0.07$. Using our numerical parameter values in (4.4), from (4.3) we see how the optimal nominal consumption to wealth ratio depends on time t. The results are shown in Figure 1. Similarly, we consider a high risk-tolerance investor with $\kappa=0.7$ and $\beta=0.8$. Using our numerical parameter values in (4.4), from (4.3) we see how the optimal nominal consumption to wealth ratio depends on time t. The

results are shown in Figure 2. From Figures 1-2, we see that an investor with high risk-aversion increases his the optimal nominal consumption rate as the time gets long, while his optimal consumption rate is larger during the state of a good economy than during the state of a bad economy; conversely, an investor with high risk tolerance decreases his the optimal nominal consumption rate as the time gets long, while his optimal consumption rate is smaller during the state of a good economy than during the state of a bad economy.



FIGURE 1. An Investor with High Risk Aversion ($\kappa = 10$ and $\beta = 0.07$)



FIGURE 2. An Investor with High Risk Tolerance ($\kappa = 0.7$ and $\beta = 0.8$)

V. Conclusions and comments

In this paper, we first describe an uncertain stochastic control system with Markov-modulated. In order to build an optimality equation for control laws, we generalize an Itô-Liu formula for uncertain stochastic processes with Markovian switching. From this, the HJB equation of the value function for the uncertain stochastic Markov-modulated control system is provided, from which the optimal control law can be deduced. We think this is one of the main contributions of this paper.

Following it, by the application of optimality equation for optimal control law, we study the optimal consumption and portfolio problem under an uncertain stochastic environment with regime switching, in which the prices of the risky assets are driven by risky uncertainty sources and Liu's uncertainty sources. An investor's utility comes from both the consumption and the wealth. Employing the results on a Markovian-modulated uncertain stochastic control, we derive the HJB equation satisfied by the optimal control law (consumption and portfolio), from which we get the optimal consumption and portfolio polices. This is another contribution of our paper. As far as we know, Zhou and Yin [34] obtained explicit solutions to classical stochastic control problems with regime switching. Sotomayor and Cadenillas [30] presented the versions of the HJB equation for classical stochastic control with regime switching in infinite horizon. However, the framework of our model is different from theirs.

Finally, for an investor with CRRA utility functions, by using Corollary 3.2, we give an explicit formula for optimal policies. Through the numerical simulation, an economic analysis of optimal policies is made. And we find that the qualitative behavior of the consumption to wealth ratio depends not only on the regime but also on the level of risk aversion.

Besides, a stochastic financial market with inflation described in Bensoussan et al. [1] can be extended to an uncertain stochastic market with both regime switching and inflation, which will be further studied in future.

References

[1] Bensoussan, A., J. Keppo, and S. P. Sethi (2009): Optimal consumption and portfolio decisions with partially observed real prices, *Mathematical Finance* 19(2), 251-279.

[2] Buffington, J., and R. J. Elliott (2002): American options with regime switching, *Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance* 5(5), 497-514.

[3] Fei, W. Y. (2007): Existence and uniqueness of solution for fuzzy random differential equations with non-Lipschitz coefficiets, *Information Sciences* 177, 4329-4337.

[4] Fei, W. Y. (2007): A generalization of Bihari's inequality and fuzzy random differential equations with non-Lipschitz coefficents, *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems* 15 (4), 425-439.

[5] Fei, W. Y. (2007): Optimal consumption and portfolio choice with ambiguity and anticipation, *Information Sciences* 177, 5178-5190.

[6] Fei, W. Y. (2009): Optimal portfolio choice based on α-MEU under ambiguity, *Stochastic Models* 25, 455-482.

[7] Fei, W. Y. (2009): Uniqueness of solutions to fuzzy differential equations driven by Liu's process with non-Lipschitz coefficients, *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery (FSKD' 09)*, Vol. 6, pp. 565-569.

[8] Fei, W. Y. (2010): Optimal control of Markovian switching systems with applications to portfolio decisions under inflation, Preprint.

[9] Fei, W. Y. (2013): Optimal consumption and portfolio under inflation and Markovian switching, *Stochastics* 85(2), 272-285.

[10] Fei, W. Y., H. J. Liu, and D. R. Ding (2010): On LaSalle-type theorems for fuzzy differential delay equations, *Proceedings of 2010 International Conference on Computer Application and System Modeling (ICCASM 2010)*, Vol. 2, pp. 81-85

[11] Fei, W. Y., and R. Q. Wu (2002): Anticipative portfolio optimization under constraints and a higher interest rate for borrowing, *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* 20, 311-345.

[12] Feng, J. -E., J. Lam, and Z. Shu (2010): Stabilization of Markovian systems via probability rate synthesis and output feedback, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 55(3), 773-777.

[13] Guo, X., and Q. Zhang (2004): Closed-form solutions for perpetual American put options with regime switching, *SIAM J. Contl. Opt.* 64(6), 2034-2049.

[14] Hamilton, J. (1989): A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle, *Econometrica* 57, 357-384.

[15] Hirsch, M. W., S. Smale, and R. L. Devaney (2006): *Differential Equations, Dynamical Systems and an Introduction to Chaos,* Singapore: Elsevier.

[16] Huang, L. R., and X. R. Mao (2009): On input-to-state stability of stochastic retarded systems with Markovian switching , *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 54(8), 1898-1902.

[17] Huang, X. (2007): A new perspective for optimal portfolio selection with random fuzzy returns, *Information Sciences* 177, 5404-5414.

[18] Kaleva, O. (1987): Fuzzy differential equations, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 24, 301-317.

[19] Karatzas, I., and S. Shreve (1991): *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculas, 2nd edition,* New York: Springer.

[20] Karatzas, I., and S. Shreve (1998): *Methods of Mathematical Finance,* New York: Springer.

[21] Kwakernaak, H. (1978): Fuzzy random variables-I: Definition and theorem, *Information Science* 15, 1-29.

[22] Liu, B. D. (2011): *Uncertainty Theory,* http://orsc.edu.cn/liu.

[23] Liu, Y. H. (2013): Uncertain random variables: A mixture of uncertainty and randomness, *Soft Comput.* 17, 625-634.

[24] Liu, Y. K., and B. Liu (2003): Fuzzy random variables: A scalar expected value operator, *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making* 1, 143-160.

[25] Mariton, M. (1990): *Jump Linear Systems in Automatic Control,* New York: Marcel Dekker.

[26] Merton, R. (1969): Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: The continuous-time case, *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 51, 247-257.

[27] Merton, R. (1971): Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous time model, *J. Econ. Theory* 3, 373-413.

[28] Puri, M. L., and D. Ralescu (1986): Fuzzy random variable, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 114, 409-422.

[29] Skorohod, A. V. (1989): *Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Stochastic Differential Equations,* Providence: American Mathematical Society.

[30] Sotomayor, L. R., and A. Cadenillas (2009): Explicit solutions of consumption-investment problems in financial markets with regime switching, *Mathematical Finance* 19(2), 251-279.

[31] You, C. L. (2007): Some extensions of Wiener-Liu process and Ito-Liu integral, Available at: orsc.edu.cn/process/071019.pdf.

[32] Zhang, Q., and G. Yin (2004): Nearly-optimal asset allocation in hybrid stock investment models, *J. Opt. Theory. Applicat.* 121(2), 197-222.

[33] Yong, J. M., and X. Y. Zhou (1999): *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations,* New York: Springer.

[34] Zhou, X. Y., and G. Yin (2003): Markowitz's mean-variance portfolio selection with regime switching: A continuous time model, *SIAM J. Contl. Opt.* 42(4), 1466-1482.

[35] Zhu, Y. G. (2010): Uncertain optimal control with application to a portfolio selection model, *Cybernetics and Systems* 41, 535-547.